



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/804,772      | 03/13/2001  | Andre P. Guillory    | 390073              | 2684             |

7590 11/13/2003

Lathrop & Gage L.C.  
Suite 2800  
2345 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64108

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

NGUYEN, PHUNG

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2632

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/804,772

Applicant(s)

GUILLORY, ANDRE P.

Examiner

Phung T Nguyen

Art Unit

2632

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☒ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See the attachmentt.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 18-23.Claim(s) objected to: 6,11,13 and 16.Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14-15, and 17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The Affidavit filed on 10/09/03 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Schwoegler (U.S. Pat. 6,590,529) reference.

1. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Schwoegler reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The provided record shows evidence of an invention that is not the same as the disclosure/claims invention. For example, the claimed "type data indicating a type of severe weather and area designation data for a specific area comprising at least one member of a group consisting of sector data indicating a sector in which the severe weather is expected" is not supported in the evidence. Since invention from provided differs from current invention, conception has not been established.
2. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Schwoegler reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. Since conception has not been established, it follows that diligence has not been established either.
3. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish applicant's alleged actual reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country after the effective date of the Schwoegler reference as per the above reasons.


Art Unit: 2632

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phung T Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-308-6252. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm Mon thru. Friday, with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Examiner: Phung Nguyen

  
BENJAMIN C. LEE  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2632

Date: November 4, 2003